

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action dated July 18, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-28, and 30-33 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 10, 18, and 26 are independent. In the Final Office Action, Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-28, and 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-28, and 30-33 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-28 and 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,963,864 ("O'Neil") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,694, 004 ("Knoerte"). Claims 1, 10, 18, and 26 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "wherein determining whether the wired terminal and the wireless terminal of the subscriber are available comprises, determining whether the wired terminal is available, determining whether the wireless terminal is available, and determining whether the wireless terminal has a voice messaging system in response to

determining that the wireless terminal is available,” and “wherein, if the wireless terminal is determined to have the voice messaging system, the second outgoing communication is placed before the first outgoing communication is answered by the voice messaging system.” Amended Claims 10, 18, and 26 each includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 4, lines 5-8 and page 5, lines 11-14.

Consistent with embodiments of the invention, once a switch detects an incoming call, a service control point may execute a series of verifications. (See specification, page 4, lines 5-6.) The service control point may verify whether a subscriber’s landline telecommunications unit and a subscriber’s wireless telecommunications unit are available. (See specification, page 4, lines 7-8.) Accordingly, attempts to reach a subscriber’s wireless unit are only made when the wireless unit is available. (See specification, page 5, lines 11-12.) As a result, in situations where the subscriber’s wireless telecommunications unit has a voice messaging system, the voice messaging system will not answer before the landline telecommunications unit rings. (See specification, page 5, lines 12-14.)

In contrast, *O’Neil* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitations. For example, *O’Neil* discloses a system and method for providing telecommunication extension services to a subscriber unit. (See abstract, lines 1-2.) *O’Neil*’s method for telecommunication extension services comprises a check to determine whether an appropriate wireless unit is available for communication. (See col. 29, lines 23-24.) If the wireless unit is not available, then *O’Neil* provides conventional telecommunications services to the subscriber unit. (See col. 29, lines 25-27.) However, if the check in